REMARKS

This Amendment and the following remarks are intended to fully respond to the Office Action mailed June 22, 2007. In that Office Action, claims 1-40 were examined and all claims were rejected. More specifically, Claims 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the Examiner asserts that the claims are directed toward non-statutory subject matter; and Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Horvitz et al. (US 5,880,733), hereinafter "Horvitz," in view of Miller (US 6,597,358), hereinafter "Miller."

Reconsideration of these rejections, as they might apply to the original and amended claims in view of these remarks, is respectfully requested.

In this Response, claims 1, 7, 12, and 17-20 have been amended and no claims have been added or cancelled canceled. Therefore, claims 1-20 remain present for examination.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the Examiner asserts that the claims are directed toward non-statutory subject matter. In the interest of prosecution, Applicants have amended these claims. However, applicants note that these amendments are made without prejudice and Applicants reserve the right to pursue such subject matter in the future or in a continuation application. Claims 17-20 have been amended to recite computer storage medium. According to the specification,

> "[c]omputer storage media includes volatile and nonvolatile, removable and non-removable media implemented in any method or technology for storage of information such as computer readable instructions, data structures, program modules or other data. Memory **204**, removable storage **208** and non-removable storage **210** are all examples of computer storage media. Computer storage media includes, but is not limited to, RAM, ROM, EEPROM, flash memory or other memory technology, CD-ROM, digital versatile disks (DVD) or other optical storage, magnetic cassettes, magnetic tape, magnetic disk storage or other magnetic storage devices, or any other medium which can be used to store the desired information and which can accessed by system **200**. Any such computer storage media may be part of system **200**." (Specification, p. 6, ll. 17-25).

The embodiments recited in the amended claims are encoded in tangible, computer-readable media and are, thus, patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. *In re*

Beauregard, 53 F.3d 1583, 1584 (Fed. Cir. 1995). In light of these amendments, the rejection is now moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being as being obvious over Horvitz in view of Miller. Applicants respectfully traverse the § 103(a) rejections because either the Examiner failed to state a *prima facie* case of obviousness or the current amendments to the claims now render the Examiner's arguments moot. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the references must teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. M.P.E.P §§ 2142, 2143.03; *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (C.C.P.A. 1974); *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385 (C.C.P.A. 1970). Further, under *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, there "must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007). Specifically, the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least performing an inverse transformation on the input device location point if the input device point is within the bounding rectangle, wherein performing the inverse transformation results in a new frame region and performing a hit test on the new frame region.

Horvitz relates to an invention provides a three-dimensional perspective, virtual workspace to window based display systems. The user may activate control buttons to transform a typical two-dimensional window to a three-dimensional perspective, virtual workspace. The transformation to the three-dimensional workspace provides a perspective or sense of depth to the display of the windows containing computer applications. In this manner, a simulated three-dimensional window display environment for the operating system is provided. The operating system utilized in connection with the present invention receives data for storage in a destination rectangle in a frame buffer. The data designated for storage in a destination rectangle is generally given in pixel coordinates. The operating system scales the data's dimensions to provide a three-dimensional perspective appearance on the display screen. When a user indicates that a window should be displayed in a particular perspective or size, coordinates representing the window and data contained therein are multiplied by a transformation matrix to yield the specified perspective or size. (Horvitz, Abstract).

The Examiner has failed to show that Horvitz teaches or suggest performing an inverse transformation on the input device location point if the input device point is within the bounding rectangle, wherein performing the inverse transformation results in a new frame region and performing a hit test on the new frame region. Thus, claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference.

Miller does not compensate for this deficiency. Miller relates to a method and apparatus for organizing two and/or three-dimensional computer applications on a display in three-dimensional viewing perspective. (Miller, Abstract). Miller teaches creating at least one two dimensional bitmap for a computer application and one three-dimensional geometry. The bits from the two dimensional bitmap are mapped to the three dimensional geometry. Finally, Miller teaches displaying the three-dimensional geometry with the bits mapped thereon. (*Id.*, col. 2, ll. 12-20). This mapping is used to translate commands from the three-dimensional geometry to the two-dimensional bitmap. (*Id.*, col. 6, ll. 2-7).

Miller does not teach or suggest performing an inverse transformation on the input device location point if the input device point is within the bounding rectangle, wherein performing the inverse transformation results in a new frame region and performing a hit test on the new frame region. Indeed, Miller uses a mapping to translate commands. The Examiner has not shown that the mapping consists of performing an inverse transformation on the input device location point if the input device point is within the bounding rectangle, wherein performing the inverse transformation results in a new frame region. Furthermore, the Examiner has not show that Miller teaches or suggests performing a hit test on the new frame region. The Examiner has not shown that Miller ever performs a hit test. Thus, Miller teaches a method where a mapping is used to translate commands solely from a three-dimensional geometry to a two dimensional bitmap. On the other hand, the subject matter of the present disclosure provides the advantages of mapping user inputs to application logic no matter how the window has been transformed, among other benefits. Thus, the cited references fail to teach or suggest performing an inverse transformation on the input device location point if the input device point is within the bounding rectangle, wherein performing the inverse transformation results in a new frame region and performing a hit test on the new frame region, as recited in claim 1. For at least the forgoing reasons, claim 1 is allowable.

Independent claims 7 and 17 recite similar limitations as claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reason. Claim 7 recites performing a hit test on a new frame region in the logical coordinate system. Claim 17 recites performing an inverse transformation on the input device location point if the input device point is within the bounding rectangle, wherein performing the inverse transformation results in a new frame region; and performing a hit test on the new frame region. Thus, for at least the same reasons previously noted, claims 7 and 17 are allowable over the cited references.

Furthermore independent claim 12 recites similar limitations as claim 1. Claim 12 recites a redirection transform application interface coupled to the manager, wherein the redirection transform application performs an inverse transformation that results in a new frame region and performs hit detection on the new frame region. Thus, for at least the same reasons previously noted with respect to claim 1, claim 12 is allowable over the cited references. For the forgoing reasons, Horvitz and Miller do not teach all the limitations of independent claims 1, 7, 12, and 17 and therefore cannot anticipate the present invention as claimed. The independent claims are allowable over the prior art of record and should be allowed. All other claims, *i.e.*, claims 2-6, 8-11, 13-16, and 18-20 depend from the allowable independent claims and are, thus, also allowable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance, for all claims, at his earliest convenience.

Conclusion

This Amendment fully responds to the Office Action mailed on June 22, 2007. Still, that Office Action may contain arguments and rejections that are not directly addressed by this Amendment due to the fact that they are rendered moot in light of the preceding arguments in favor of patentability. Hence, failure of this Amendment to directly address an argument raised in the Office Action should not be taken as an indication that the Applicants believe the argument has merit. Furthermore, the claims of the present application may include other elements, not discussed in this Amendment, which are not shown, taught, or otherwise suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the preceding arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

It is believed that no further fees are due with this Response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

In light of the above remarks and amendments, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. Should any additional issues need to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned to attempt to resolve those issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 22, 2007

John B. Phillips, Reg. No. 37,206
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(303) 357-1634